

Preparation Periodic Review Planning 2005-12 ***draft 10-05-04***

National Accreditation of Unit/Specialty Programs:

Michigan Department of Education (MDE) encourages approved Michigan teacher preparation institutions to consider national accreditation by either National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) or Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) as an approach to maintaining state approval. MDE will maintain a partnership and some staffing of committees working with these two United States Department of Education recognized teacher preparation accrediting bodies.

- Both the NCATE partnership agreement and the TEAC state protocol will assume and recognize that the Entry-Level Standards for Michigan Teachers (ELSMT) are the core of preparation in Michigan and that institutions will not ignore any of the ELSMT in their development of data and measures of outcomes.
- For unit and for specialty programs, MDE will accept the results of NCATE and TEAC reviews of programs that have already once met new State Board of Education (SBE) standards.
- The exact configuration of these results will vary as NCATE and TEAC use different approaches, but MDE will work with raw data and/or reports that each institution develops for the accrediting agency.
- The decisions of national accreditation teams will be used as broad indicators of outcomes and will be part of the MDE accountability system available to the public, as well as part of MDE's formula development and identification of HEA Title 2 Low Performing institutions.
- The state will have access to all specific datapoints in the reports to these accrediting bodies and may, at its discretion, choose to update the MDE accountability website with any such datapoints that do not constitute a threat to student confidentiality.
- MDE will identify benchmarks for all outcome indicators and translations of national accreditation evidence to state accountability factors.
- MDE will use state accountability factors and translations from national accreditation for HEA Low Performing formula.

State Review of Programs:

Approved Michigan teacher preparation institutions have the option of seeking state review and approval of both the education unit and all specialty programs.

- *The state will **NOT** review only those programs that fail a national accreditation.*
- There will be no annual fee for participating in state review.
- Submission of data in a timely electronic manner.
- Attendance of specified discipline and/or unit faculty at designated annual technical assistance meetings (re ELSMT and specific disciplines) is required.

- All travel costs related to attendance and submission of data to be paid by the institution.

Programs the state has already reviewed to new SBE standards and approved will have continued approval until either:

- 2-3 years of outcomes data show a continuing problem that has not been addressed with an improvement plan or
- the institution fails to provide/cooperate in developing outcomes evidence for 3 years.

Rather than reviewing all the programs from a few institutions every year in the 7-year cycle, with the institution the key to what is reviewed in a year, MDE will review the outcomes indicator data from **all** the preparation programs in a few specific disciplines at one time, on a planned schedule.

- MDE will identify benchmarks on key indicators that are required for continued approval, as well as any mission-specific outcomes that institutions may elect to show.
- Most state-reviewed institutions would have some programs up for review in any given year.
- The review itself will depend mostly upon electronically submitted data and faculty attendance would focus on shared review of problems/issues and shared technical assistance and program improvement efforts.
- MDE would provide development opportunities (possibly content forums) collectively to state-approved and nationally accredited programs in each scheduled discipline at this time - perhaps once or twice in the 7-year cycle, depending on the needs and centrality of the discipline.
 - All state reviewed institutions are required to participate fully in such forums, with discipline faculty as specified by MDE.
 - If an institution's content program depends heavily upon community college programming or alternative delivery modes, representatives from those sources must be included on the review sessions.
 - Nationally accredited institutions are invited to participate as well.
- MDE would apply a formula for HEA Title 2 Low Performing and identify any institutions in danger of Low Performing, using discipline-specific data along with unit data that acknowledges different missions, in a clear weighted plan (see MACTE 2002 as starting point).
- MDE would also provide a collaborative development event on one or two of the seven ELSMT on a pre-determined schedule each year in a forum around institutional assessment of candidates' readiness in that standard area (see "Unit Review").
 - All state-reviewed institutions are required to participate fully in this event, sharing their assessment methods and exemplars.
 - Nationally accredited institutions are invited to participate as well.
 - Within the planned assistance, there would be a special effort to include those in danger of Low Performing designation in specific development activities.

By September 2005:

Plan to post results for all content area programs on Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC) (some may be aggregated to avoid low N) and surveys, as available across all areas.

- 3 year rolling pass rate on discipline tests if N > 10.
- A number or letter factor showing improvement (or slope of change?) if N is sufficient. If needed, aggregate disciplines into larger categories for this, per national accountability standards.
- Summary survey statistic on discipline/pedagogy readiness from candidates—a score of central tendency (may use 3-year rolling figure).
- Summary survey statistic on discipline readiness from observer — possibly supervisor of student teaching — a score of central tendency.
- MDE approved areas can also show, “MDE approved through 200Z”
- NCATE institutions could also show, “NCATE SPA accredited through 200X.”

Phase 1: 2004-05 Planning

Work with 3 content areas’ MDE staff and institutional representatives to identify outcomes and indicators for review and for posting on MDE website on specialty areas.

Proposal: Start with 3 content areas, including one core academic content area. Invite all programs to participate — even NCATE and TEAC institutions may be part of technical assistance and may use the work and thinking on outcomes, if so desired.

Added indicators from internal assessment systems from those who are state reviewed or who volunteer to have added indicators.

- Special Education.
- Mathematics (all institutions).
- Physical Education or Health may be 3rd area.

Phase 2: Activity in 2005-06

- By September 2005, be able to show on website the indicators for above 3 areas as developed.
- Develop similar indicators in at least one core area (reading/English related areas or Social Studies); if needed, identify unique indicators for specific disciplines — e.g., are Vocational different?
- Add 1/3 of remaining somewhat related groups — e.g., Family? Library?
- Identify any institutions in danger of Low Performing along with unit data.

Phase 3: Activity in 2006-07

- By September 2006, be able to show on website the indicators for these new areas as developed during 2005-6 planning and follow-up.
- Develop indicators in either Reading/English or Social Studies — whichever was not in Phase 2.
- Add Arts??

- Identify any institutions in danger of Low Performing along with unit data.

Phase 4: Activity in 2007-08

- By September 2007, be able to show on website the indicators for these new areas as developed during 2006-7 planning and follow-up.
- Indicators for all elementary programs.
- Develop indicators in Science programs; any others that were not new standards through 2005.
- Identify any institutions in danger of Low Performing along with unit data.

Phase 5: (Mature Stage) 2008 and on:

Revisit indicators for Phase 1 groups and add any indicators for content areas that had been newly approved to new SBE standards during preceding 4 years, in addition to MTTC and survey data that is understood to be ongoing.

- Provide professional development in disciplines as needed to correspond to above.
- Identify any institutions in danger of Low Performing along with unit data.

Roles and Responsibilities:

MDE

- Manage and publish the aggregate (for unit) and, if possible, single discipline MTTC scores on the MDE website.
- Maintain a record of formal institutional choice of review option.
- Maintain a record of accreditation and approval status of each institution and each specialty program at an institution.
- Develop the ELSMT outcome indicators for state review.
- Develop the website on accountability to include more specialty indicators than MTTC.
- Develop and publish the survey results of candidates and supervisors in appropriate areas (e.g., specific content area results) on the MDE website.
- Develop and offer technical assistance in scheduled years for specific content and for specified ELSMT.
- Use, in state accountability website and reporting, good faith indicators developed by NCATE or TEAC-accredited institutions in lieu of adding burdens of reporting to these institutions.
- Facilitate and maintain records of Periodic Review Council (PRC) decisions.
- Others to be determined.

MDE and MACTE jointly:

- Identify the role and responsibilities of the PRC.
- Identify the formula for Low Performing and test it.

- Agree that ELSMT is considered to be the backbone of any claim made by an institution about its preparation of teachers and hence is to be the backbone of reporting indicators of success.
- Agree that all institutions, whether state-approved, NCATE, or TEAC, will be represented on the MDE accountability website.
- Recognize that all institutions will report any indicators required for MDE to comply with its state formula for responding to federal reporting of HEA Low Performing status.
- Others to be determined.

Institutions Choosing State Review:

- Cooperate with MDE schedule for ELSMT and for specialty program review.
- Develop required indicators of outcomes for both ELSMT and specialty programs, as scheduled.
- Post or submit electronically all required indicators.
- Post or submit electronically an improvement plan based upon the areas of need identified by outcomes indicators.
- Agree, if the specialty program or institution is identified as needing assistance, to follow up annually on progress in implementing the improvement plan and in addressing continued outcomes gaps.
- Provide discipline faculty to participate in electronic reviews of peer specialty program indicators as scheduled by MDE; any travel or access costs are the responsibility of the institution.
- Others to be determined.

SpecialtyReviewPlanning2005.doc